

### REMARKS

In response to the non-final office action of May 19, 2005, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-50 and 58-72 are now pending, of which claims 1-2, 4-5, 23-24, 27-29, 35, 37-39, 45 and 47 are independent. Claims 1-5, 17-18, 23-25 and 27 have been amended, claims 51-57 have been cancelled and 58-72 have been added. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been added.

The rejections of claims 51-57 is rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims, which was motivated by Applicant's desire to expedite favorable prosecution of this case.

Claims 1-50 were deemed allowable (see paragraph 6 on page 5 of the 5/19/2005 office action).

Various of claims 1-27 are now amended to replace "interstate" with "road", and to replace "interstate shield route symbol" with "graphical road-identifying symbol". This change is not believed to impact the allowability of these claims. Consistent with remarks submitted in the previous Amendment, the cited prior art fails to associate a graphical road-identifying symbol that has substantially the same appearance as a road sign with less than all presented maneuvers being presented along a route and involving the particular road.

New claims 58-63 are added to recite that the road comprises an interstate, and that the graphical road-related symbol comprises an interstate shield route symbol.

New claim 64 is also added, reciting that the priority associated with and used as a basis for determining the route symbol is a priority associated with a route symbol type corresponding to the route symbol.

New claims 65-72 are added to recite limitations similar to those recited by presently pending claims 9-16, respectively, but which differ from claims 9-16 in that they do not depend from intervening claim 6, and thus, do not require an interstate highway.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be

Applicant : Michael David Schmitz  
Serial No. : 10/620,378  
Filed : July 17, 2003  
Page : 18 of 18


Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-383001 /  
Communications 100

exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$520.00 for excess claim fees (\$400.00) and for the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$120.00). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 2, 2005

  
Barbara A. Benoit  
Reg. No. 54,777

*Walter Reed*  
*Reg No 41265 Reg*

←

**Customer No.: 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331